

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 1-8 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended. Claims 7-8 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Accordingly, claims 1-6 are presented for reconsideration.

Claims 1, 3-4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over Abe et al. in view of Ostrem. Claim 1 is amended to recite features neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art, namely:

... fitting the main body to the adhesive supplied in the adhesion reinforcing portion **causing a portion of a surface of the main body to contact the adhesive** ...

... forming an adhesion reinforced part for fixing the main body to the substrate by heating and curing the adhesive by sealing the inside of the adhesive with solder part by fusing and solidifying of solder particles contained in the adhesive supplied in the adhesion reinforcing portion **causing the adhesive to spread and contact a larger portion of the surface of the main body**. (Emphasis added).

Applicants' exemplary embodiment includes a substrate 1, an electrical component 5 an adhesion reinforcing portion 7b. Electrical component 5 includes connection terminals 5a disposed at both ends of a main body 5b (Figs. 1C and 1D). The adhesion reinforcing portion 7b includes a solder paste 4. The solder paste 4 is a mixture of a metal component containing solder particles and thermosetting adhesive. (Page 7, lines 9-10). Because solder paste 4 of adhesion reinforcing portion 7b is a mixture of a metal component containing solder particles and thermosetting adhesive, solder paste 4 spreads over the main body and **fixes the main body 5b to the substrate 1**. (Page 7, lines 9-16, page 9, line 25 to page 10, line 4 and Fig. 3).

As shown at FIG. 1C of Applicants' exemplary embodiment, a portion of the lower surface of main body 5b contacts the adhesive 4B. Further, as shown at FIG. 1D, after the adhesive is heated, the adhesive spreads out and contacts a larger portion of the lower surface of main body 5b. Thus, claim 1 recites "... fitting the main body to the adhesive supplied in the adhesion reinforcing portion **causing a portion of a surface of the main body to contact the adhesive** ..." and "... the adhesion

reinforcing portion **causing the adhesive to spread and contact a larger portion of the surface of the main body."**

Ostrem discloses a solder fillet 113, a height control pad 111, a body portion 117 and a substrate 115. Body portion 117 is disposed on solder fillet 113. Solder fillet 113 is disposed on height control pad 111. Height control pad 111 is disposed on top of substrate 115. (Fig. 1). That is, solder fillet 113 only contacts body portion 117 for height control and does not spread out and fix body portion 117 to substrate 115. Further, Ostrem recites "... when the portion of solder paste disposed onto the height control pad cools down to a solid structure it maintains the height established in the liquidus stage." That is, the solder paste in Ostrem maintains its height on the height control pad and does not, therefore, spread and contact a larger portion of body portion 117 when the solder paste is heated. Accordingly, Ostrem does not disclose "... the adhesion reinforcing portion **causing the adhesive to spread and contact a larger portion of the surface of the main body,"** as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

The Office Action readily admits that Abe et al. does not disclose or suggest "... supplying the adhesive to an adhesive reinforcing portion ..." (page 4, lines 1-2). That is, Abe et al. does not make up for the deficiencies described above with respect to Ostrem.

Thus, neither Ostrem, Abe et al., nor their combination disclose or suggest "... fitting the main body to the adhesive supplied in the adhesion reinforcing portion **causing a portion of a surface of the main body to contact the adhesive ..."** and "... the adhesion reinforcing portion **causing the adhesive to spread and contact a larger portion of the surface of the main body,"** as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Claim 3 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, claim 3 is likewise allowable over the art of record.

Claim 4, while not identical to claim 1, includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Thus, claim 4 is also allowable over the art of record for at least reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Application No.: 10/590,473  
Amendment Dated: May 8, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of: March 10, 2009

MAT-8888US

Claim 6 depends from claim 4. Accordingly, claim 6 is likewise allowable over the art of record.

Claims 2 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Abe et al., Ostrem and Huang et al. Huang et al. is cited for its teaching of an adhesive that partially overlaps a plurality of electrodes. Huang et al. does not make up for the deficiencies of Abe et al. and Ostrem described above with respect to claims 1 and 4. Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and claim 5 depends from claim 4. Accordingly, claims 2 and 5 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this Application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738  
Attorney for Applicants

DFD/dfd/dmw/fp

Dated: May 8, 2009

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

DMW/419937